



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2017

No. 166

Senate

The Senate met at 4 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, we bless Your Holy Name. Provide our lawmakers with the wisdom to obey You completely and receive Your guidance. May Your guiding presence inspire them so that they can find, even in troubles, opportunities for joy.

Lord, remind them of the blessings that come from being challenged, as they learn from experience that the things that test them produce endurance. When their endurance is fully developed, give them the satisfaction of possessing such integrity that their faith will not shrink, though pressed by many foes.

Lord, help our Senators to seek You repeatedly each day with their prayers, fully expecting You to answer their intercession and direct their lives.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Gingrich nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Callista L. Gingrich, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 5:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

If no one yields time, the time will be equally divided.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

WORK BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, as I discussed with the President and the Vice President at our working lunch today, the Senate has a full schedule of important work ahead of us.

The Senate's fall agenda includes confirming more nominees to the judiciary, administration, and other important positions. Later today we will resume consideration of another nominee, Callista Gingrich, who has been nominated to serve as our Ambassador to the Vatican. That agenda includes providing continued assistance to communities affected by the recent hurricanes, and we will process the President's supplemental funding request to do just that. The Senate's agenda also includes completing work on the budget resolution and advancing tax reform—two things that are critical to helping our economy finally realize its true potential after the stagnation of the last decade.

This budget will be the next step to spurring growth in our economy. It provides a pathway to balance, it reins

in Federal spending, and it honors our commitments to Social Security and provides for the national defense.

In addition to these important aspects of this budget, it will also provide the legislative tools to advance tax reform. As I have said before, tax reform is the single most important thing we can do today to get our economy moving again.

We think taxes should be lower, simpler, and fairer for middle-class workers so that Americans can keep more of their own hard-earned money in their paychecks. We think taxes should be reformed to end the perverse incentives that help keep American jobs and profits offshore and so it is easier to make and keep American jobs where they belong—right here at home.

We think it is time to take more money out of Washington's pockets and put more money in the pockets of the American middle class. That is why we know it is time for tax reform.

The tax reform goals I just mentioned are shared by many, including the President, his team, Chairman ORRIN HATCH, and Chairman MIKE ENZI. As I said, to get there, we first need to pass the budget before us. I want to thank Chairman ENZI and the members of the Senate Budget Committee for all of their work in getting us to this point. As we advance that budget on the Senate floor this week, Senators on both sides of the aisle will have the opportunity to offer their input.

I look forward to putting our finances on a better path with this budget, just as I look forward to continuing with the other important initiatives on the Senate's fall agenda.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If no one yields time, the time will be charged equally.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, on the issue of healthcare, last week, President Trump committed two

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S6383

acts of pointless sabotage of our Nation's healthcare system. He signed an Executive order that would give insurers more latitude to sell temporary, junk plans that are not only incredibly risky to the consumer but undermine the rest of the healthcare market by drawing healthy Americans out of the pool. Even worse, President Trump decided to stop the cost-sharing program, which reduces premiums, deductibles, and copays for 7 million Americans a year. There is literally no upside to the President's decision to end the cost-sharing program.

Because of the President's actions, premiums will go up between 20 and 25 percent, according to the CBO. Just today in Pennsylvania, we saw premiums rise by 30 percent as a direct result of the President's actions. Deductibles and out-of-pocket costs will go up by thousands of dollars. Deficits will rise by \$194 billion because the government will have to pay more in subsidies to make up for the lack of the cost-sharing program, and the marketplaces will become less stable because more people will go uninsured.

The Republican Governor of Nevada, Brian Sandoval, may have said it best:

It's going to hurt people. It's going to hurt kids. It's going to hurt families. It's going to hurt individuals. It's going to hurt people with mental health issues. It's going to hurt veterans. It's going to hurt everybody.

That is from Republican Governor Brian Sandoval.

Another point that the President should hear is that nearly 70 percent of the Americans who benefit from these cost-sharing payments live in States that Donald Trump won in the election.

Make no mistake about it—the President is deliberately undermining our healthcare system with these two actions. When premiums go up because of this action, the blame will fall on his shoulders.

There is a way out. The way out of all of this is for Congress to aggressively pursue a bipartisan healthcare bill that will take cost-sharing out of the President's hands by locking in the payments. For many months, Democrats have been pushing to stabilize the markets and to work toward a bipartisan agreement that would keep premiums down for millions of Americans. Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY have been negotiating a package that would include cost-sharing as well as some provisions that the Republicans want. These negotiations began long before the President's decision to end cost-sharing last week. I am encouraged by the progress of the negotiations, and I am hopeful that we are nearing an agreement that makes clear that we have no intention of supporting the President's reckless efforts at sabotage.

If President Trump is now supportive of an agreement that stabilizes and improves the existing system under the Affordable Care Act, we certainly welcome the change of heart. We have

been asking for this for a long time. We hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in their realizing the damage the President has done, will join us in strengthening, not in sabotaging, the healthcare system.

TAX REFORM AND THE BUDGET

Madam President, now a word on the Republican tax plan.

This week, the Republican majority will likely move to pass a budget resolution that includes reconciliation instructions to increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion. Amazingly, it also includes a total of \$1.5 trillion in cuts to Medicare and Medicaid. Cutting taxes on the wealthy to be paid for by cutting Medicare and Medicaid? How many Americans want that—Democrat, Republican, Independent, liberal, conservative? The GOP budget makes it as clear as day that the Republicans will try to pay for a massive tax cut for the wealthy by cutting Medicare and Medicaid. It is the same formula they used for TrumpCare—cutting healthcare to pay for tax cuts for the rich. The American people rose up against that plan, and it failed. This plan should fail for the same exact reason.

Now the White House is out with a new report today, which reads that a giant tax cut for big corporations will increase wages for middle-class Americans. President Trump complains about fake news. Well, this is fake math, and it is as bad as any of the so-called fake news the President has complained about. This is a deliberate manipulation of numbers and facts that, quite frankly, is appalling. History shows that tax cuts like these benefit the wealthy and the powerful to the exclusion of the middle class. History shows that corporations will use tax cuts for CEO bonuses, stock buybacks, and dividends rather than for increasing worker pay or creating new jobs.

In fact, none other than Goldman Sachs concluded that shareholders, not workers, “typically get most of the benefits of tax cuts.” This is not a liberal think tank or CHUCK SCHUMER talking; this is Goldman Sachs, which represents shareholders—a lot of them. The two authors of this plan, Gary Cohn and Steve Mnuchin, who are from Goldman Sachs, should heed what their former employer says. Even Goldman Sachs is saying that the Trump tax cuts will not create massive growth or new jobs or higher wages. In fact, another recent report by Goldman Sachs predicts only the most minor growth effects from this tax cut, not more than 0.1 or 0.2 percent.

As the President likes to point out, the stock market is at record highs, and companies are raking in unprecedented profits; yet wages have remained relatively flat. The companies are already flush with money—record profits. They are not creating jobs; they are enriching their shareholders and enhancing their CEOs' salaries with stock buybacks. It is proof posi-

tive that companies already have the cash reserves but do not use them to boost wages.

To assert the opposite, which is that giving corporations and the wealthy a tax cut leads to higher middle-class wages, belies the facts and the history, and it is a blatant attempt to fool Americans into thinking that the GOP plan would benefit them when in reality it is a sop to the rich. No wonder our Republican friends cannot talk about what the plan does—cuts taxes for the wealthy and powerful. They have to hide it and say that this is job growth. Those are fake numbers, and I would like my friends on this side of the aisle to admit that they believe in trickle-down economics, because that is what their plan is all about.

Rather than helping the biggest corporations avoid paying their fair share, tax reform ought to reward those companies that create jobs and raise wages here at home. Similarly, tax reform ought to directly benefit the middle class, but the Republican tax plan slashes a key middle-class deduction in the form of the State and local deductibility.

Now let's talk about Vice President PENCE. He is visiting Buffalo, NY—a city I love in my home State. Since Vice President PENCE is traveling to Buffalo, I thought that I would share some numbers about how the elimination of the State and local deduction affects western New York.

In Representative COLLINS' district, which stretches from East Buffalo toward Rochester, 29 percent of the residents claim the State and local deduction. They get an average deduction of \$12,125. In Representative HIGGINS' district, which is in the heart of Buffalo, 27 percent of the residents claim the State and local deduction, with an average deduction of \$12,083. In Representative REED's district, which is just south and east of Buffalo, 22 percent of the residents claim the State and local deduction, with an average deduction of \$11,716. Their constituents get clobbered, as do just about all New Yorkers and so many in the rest of the country, when you eliminate the State and local deductibility. It affects the middle class and the upper class. The State and local deduction elimination is a dagger to the heart, not just to Buffalo but to Rochester, Syracuse, Albany, and all of Upstate New York.

Will Vice President PENCE have the courage to answer questions about this deduction elimination? Will he tell middle-class New Yorkers that they are going to get a huge tax increase under this bill? When the Vice President arrives in Buffalo tomorrow, I hope he is prepared to explain why he wants to hike taxes on thousands of middle-class families in the Buffalo area, in the Rochester area, in the Syracuse area, and in the Albany area.

Eliminating the State and local deduction hurts the middle class, and it hammers the New York economy. Businesses, if they do not have this State

and local deduction, are not likely to relocate in Buffalo or Rochester or Syracuse or Albany. It also hurts homeowners. Make no mistake about it—if we get rid of the State and local deduction, the values of homes will go down. That is why the realtors are so opposed to this elimination. It is not just true in New York or in California or in Connecticut or in New Jersey; it is true across the whole country.

As for my dear friend and chairman of the Finance Committee's State of Utah, because of the great charity of his people—and so many tithe—35 percent of the taxpayers will get a huge, huge increase in their taxes with the elimination of State and local deductibility. So many of them do not use the standard deduction because they are so charitable, but they are penalized for that charity.

Eliminating the State and local deduction, while slashing taxes for the wealthy and huge corporations, will hurt middle-class taxpayers.

Now there are some efforts to compromise State and local deductibility. They don't work. Some have proposed letting taxpayers make a choice between getting rid of the mortgage deduction and getting rid of the State and local deduction. That is like saying: Should I chop off my left hand or my right hand, Mr. Middle-Class Taxpayer?

Others have said: Let's limit it to people who earn below \$100,000. That still leaves lots of people at risk, particularly in high-priced areas like Long Island, and it doesn't reduce the deficit by much. It is estimated that a large percentage of the deficit will still go up.

It makes no sense to eliminate State and local deductibility. Vice President PENCE ought to go to western New York, but instead of going just to a small business—and we want to lower small business taxes—he should go to a middle-class family in Amherst or in Orchard Park or Tonawanda and tell them that he is there to raise their taxes.

NOMINATION OF TOM MARINO

Madam President, I want to address the President's nominee to lead the Office of National Drug Control Policy, Representative MARINO.

An article in yesterday's Washington Post described Representative MARINO's advocacy for a law that may have prevented the DEA, the Drug Enforcement Agency, from going after the worst practices of drug distributors. It is a profoundly troubling revelation about the man who has been tapped to lead the primary agency in our government that focuses on stopping the opioid crisis.

The opioid crisis was in part fueled by wholesale drug distributors sending millions of unnecessary pills into communities. As my friend Senator MANCHIN has pointed out, one company shipped 20 million doses of opioids to pharmacies in his State of West Virginia over a 5-year period. That in-

cluded 11 million doses sent to Mingo County, WV, where the population is 25,000. There were 11 million pills sent to a county of 25,000 people over a 5-year period. No wonder there is a crisis.

What the Washington Post revealed yesterday was that Representative MARINO worked to pass a bill in 2016 that made it “virtually impossible for the DEA to freeze suspicious narcotic shipments.” Confirming Representative MARINO as our Nation's drug czar would be like putting a wolf in charge of the henhouse.

The American people deserve someone totally committed to fighting the opioid crisis, not someone who has labored on behalf of the drug industry. So tonight I am calling on President Trump to withdraw the nomination of Representative MARINO for the ONDCP. We can do better. Senator MANCHIN has made such a call, and he is right. President Trump ought to withdraw Representative MARINO's nomination.

If the President presses forward with Representative MARINO, it will be another betrayal in a long line of betrayals on issues near and dear to rural America. The President's healthcare proposals would have put daggers into the heart of rural America, decimating Medicaid and rural hospitals. The President's tax plan lavishes the wealthy and the big corporations but does little for the working man or woman in rural America. The President promised several months ago to label the opioid crisis a national emergency, yet he still hasn't done it. He said this afternoon that he will finally do it next week. We will see.

By now, the idea that the President is sticking up for the forgotten man and woman in the forgotten parts of rural America should be dismissed. President Trump seems to have forgotten the forgotten parts of America, and his lack of action—we don't need talk; we need action—on the opioid crisis and his nomination of Representative MARINO is just another example.

CALIFORNIA WILDFIRES

Madam President, over the weekend, several parts of California were swept by some of the most devastating wildfires the region has seen. At least 40 people have died, thousands of homes and businesses have been utterly destroyed, and at one point over 100,000 people were evacuated. As Gov. Jerry Brown said, “This is truly one of the greatest, if not the greatest, tragedies that California has ever faced.”

Our thoughts are with everyone affected by these wildfires. We are enduringly grateful for the firefighters and all our first responders. And our response here in the Senate must be to send aid where aid is needed.

For our country, this has been a devastating few months of fires and floods. Hurricanes Harvey and Irma buffeted Texas, Louisiana, and Florida. Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands are contending with a humanitarian crisis on an unprecedented scale in the wake

of Hurricane Maria. Our job is to speedily send aid, and I am hopeful that we can pass another supplemental aid package this week as well as another more comprehensive package later in the year.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip is recognized.

TAX REFORM AND THE BUDGET

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, today I want to talk to you about time and how little of it we have to accomplish two incredibly important legislative priorities, one that is national in scope and potentially historic in impact. The first of those priorities is tax reform. We have a target date on the calendar, and now the clock is ticking. We have to get to work.

The budget resolution that we will consider this week sets November 13 as our deadline for the Finance Committee to report a bill, and of course the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator HATCH, is on the floor, and that is a commitment I know he takes very seriously.

This bill, I hope, will broadly cut taxes on individuals and businesses alike and put more money in the pockets of working families across the country. What I like most about the plan I have seen so far is that it is bold. We are not trimming a little here and a tiny bit there. We are slashing rates, consolidating brackets, and eliminating pet credits and deductions. This is not JV tax reform. This is tax reform that is serious and based upon our commitment to get the economy growing again.

Two weeks ago, the House approved its version of the resolution, and the Senate Budget Committee reported out its version. Now the Senate will consider the committee's resolution in the coming days. Why do we need that budget resolution? How is this all going to work?

Well, these resolutions from each Chamber are the first step in passing pro-growth tax reform. They authorize the use of a tool called budget reconciliation. That means when the tax reform legislation is considered, it can't be stopped by less than a majority of the Senate. Of course, this isn't our first choice.

I wish our colleagues across the aisle, our Democratic friends, would join us in bipartisan tax reform, but passing a budget resolution in the Senate is a must because this is something we can hold in reserve if our friends across the aisle simply refuse to participate in the process of pro-growth tax reform. It is a key procedural step because we have to fundamentally change the Tax Code before the end of the year.

How well our economy does next year, how many jobs are created, and how much investment occurs here in the United States will depend largely upon our success in passing pro-growth tax reform this year. The clock is ticking, and we have to act with dispatch and with determination.

As the President said last week in Pennsylvania, “we want lower taxes, bigger paychecks, and more jobs for . . . American workers.” He is absolutely right. Lower taxes, bigger paychecks, and more jobs are the things we all ought to want, and they are worth the fight.

Under this administration we are already seeing results. The economy is bouncing back. Unemployment is at a 16-year low. Wages are rising and the stock market is soaring. The slumbering giant, which is the U.S. economy, is now slowly awakening. Our economy reached more than 3.1 percent growth last quarter. Confidence, as the President stressed in Pennsylvania, is back when it comes to our economy and our future, but that confidence will not last long if we let this opportunity pass.

We have to find ways to get companies to stay in America, to expand, and to hire in America. We have to find ways to take the money out of Washington’s pocket and put it back into the pockets of those who earned the money in the first place—American families.

We have to find ways to simplify the Tax Code, which, let’s remember, hits families multiple times each year by taking their earnings, by stealing their time through compliance, and by trying their patience with complexity. Each tax return feels like three.

I find it appalling that a majority of taxpayers are forced to pay someone else to do their taxes for them because they simply don’t have the time or expertise to do it themselves.

The unified framework released a few weeks ago will help. It calls for collapsing seven separate tax brackets down to three. That is what I call simplification. It expands the zero bracket so that if you are a married couple earning less than \$24,000 a year, you will pay zero income taxes. It enhances the child tax credit. It repeals the death tax and special interest tax breaks, and it reduces the uncompetitive corporate tax rate to 20 percent and cuts tax rates for small businesses to the lowest level in more than 80 years. So let’s make this happen before time runs out.

HURRICANE RECOVERY EFFORT

Madam President, the other item I can’t stop thinking about is one that has taken a great toll on my State and our region of the country, and that is Hurricane Harvey, the most extreme rain event in the history of the United States. Literally 50 inches of rain fell in 5 days in the Houston area.

Last week, I saw images of the Texas World Speedway, a racecar track at College Station that is being used as a processing lot. Here is a picture of that.

At its peak, tens of thousands of cars were parked there, awaiting damage assessments by insurance companies. A sea of them had filled the entire speedway, as can be seen on this chart, and it was starting to spill into sur-

rounding areas, too—cars in all directions, as far as the eye could see.

How could Hurricane Harvey damage so many cars? Well, cars these days—the newer ones—are basically computers on wheels, and when they get wet in an extreme flooding event like this, they essentially become a total loss, like these cars at the Texas World Speedway. It is an amazing picture. All the cars there, mind you, represent only a tiny percentage of all the vehicles damaged in the storm. Some of the estimates I have heard are that as high as one-half million personal vehicles were damaged and even totaled.

The speedway is just one of the images that continue to keep me up at night. How are my constituents, these Texans, going to get to work? How are they going to take their kids to school? When will their car and their house be ready so they can live in their home? When will their highways and driveways be fixed? What is being done to ensure that history doesn’t repeat itself when, year after year, many parts of the Harris County-Houston area are flooded because many of the important Corps of Engineer projects have not been started, much less completed, which would have diverted the rain and saved many of these homes and many of these cars.

Last Thursday, the House passed a \$36.5 billion hurricane and wildfire relief bill. The vote sends the measure over to the Senate, and I look forward to debating the supplemental appropriation in the days ahead.

The House’s emergency measure is intended to replenish the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s nearly depleted coffers with \$18.7 billion to the Disaster Relief Fund. If we don’t act soon, I am told, FEMA could run out of money as early as October 23.

The House bill will also address the National Flood Insurance Program by forgiving \$16 billion of its debt and allowing it to pay more claims for property owners in Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Nevertheless, I must say I am more than a little bit disappointed by this piece of legislation. I share the frustrations of Gov. Greg Abbott and Members of the Houston area congressional delegation, who have pointed out that this bill doesn’t come close to fulfilling the very reasonable requests that have been made to rebuild and recover from Hurricane Harvey. Texas needs more, and the State deserves it, too, after all it has gone through. We are not going to throw up our hands and relent. We are going to keep on pushing.

I appreciate the assurances from Speaker PAUL RYAN and the administration that Texas will get what it needs to rebuild the homes and businesses lost in the hurricane and the funding that it needs to expand bayous and develop critical flood mitigation projects.

Governor Abbott told me the Speaker told him Congress will take up the

State’s recent request as soon as November. I am grateful to him for that promise, but we don’t need any more general statements of support. We are not asking for any more expressions of sympathy. We need specifics and a specific commitment to follow through on Texas’s demonstrated need for assistance.

I predict that the House bill will not move through the Senate until the bill provides the sort of specific commitment we could take to the bank. This isn’t about Hurricane Harvey either. This is about Hurricane Irma and Hurricane Maria.

We cannot afford to wait much longer. The Texas families who have been out of their homes since Hurricane Harvey hit can’t afford to wait much longer. The people who have lost their mode of transportation as a result of this flood and this hurricane can’t afford to wait much longer. The small businesses that have been simply wiped out and who have been denied access to the funds they need in order to restart and rebuild their lives cannot afford to wait much longer.

The clock is ticking, and I will continue to work with the Governor and the rest of the Texas delegation, as well as our friends from Florida and others who were hit by other natural disasters, to make sure that collectively we present our case to the Appropriations Committees and to the Senate. We are not asking to be treated any better than anybody else after a natural disaster like this, but we sure will not accept being treated worse. We are going to work together, on a bipartisan basis, to make sure that is the case.

Let me just close with a few words from my good friend and colleague from Laredo, TX, Representative HENRY CUELLAR. Now, Henry is what they call a Blue Dog Democrat, somebody I have worked with a lot on border issues in particular. He is on the House Appropriations Committee, and he was asked whether the House’s most recent bill was going to be the final appropriation to address the losses as a result of Hurricanes Harvey, Maria, or Irma. “No,” he said emphatically, “we are going to do more,” and he is absolutely right.

I am here to say that speaking as one Senator, I intend to make sure the U.S. Government keeps its commitments to the people in Texas, to the people in Florida, to the people in Puerto Rico, and to the people in the Virgin Islands when it comes to assisting them to recover from this terrible natural disaster.

We are not going to continue to take the promises of the Office of Management and Budget or the administration or our friends in the leadership in the House, for that matter, that we are going to get to this later. There is an expression in my part of the country that when somebody asks you when are you going to do something, the response is *manana*—tomorrow. To every question of when, it is *manana*.

We demand that this problem be dealt with on a timely basis, and we are going to keep the feet to the fire of the administration and our friends in the House to make sure they follow up on their commitments to deal with the victims of Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida be granted the floor as soon as I finish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENSURING PATIENT ACCESS AND EFFECTIVE
DRUG ENFORCEMENT ACT

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, over the weekend, the Washington Post ran an article about a piece of legislation I helped negotiate last Congress. It was entitled the "Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act" and was intended to encourage greater collaboration between DEA and the regulated community in the fight against opioid abuse. The Post article was sharply critical of this legislation, suggesting that it effectively gutted DEA's ability to do its job. It also suggested the pharmaceutical industry put one over on Congress. I rise to set the record straight on these allegations and to provide a fuller account of how this legislation passed the Senate and became law.

First, some background. The Controlled Substances Act requires drug distributors to obtain a "registration" from DEA in order to distribute controlled substances, including prescription drugs. The act further authorizes DEA to suspend a distributor's registration in certain circumstances, such as where a distributor has been convicted of a crime involving controlled substances or had a State license suspended. Before suspending a registration, DEA must issue a show cause order directing the distributor to explain why its registration should not be suspended. A court then decides whether DEA has met its burden to suspend the registration.

The Controlled Substances Act empowers DEA to bypass this standard suspension process in cases where DEA determines there is "an imminent danger to the public health or safety." In such cases, DEA can issue an immediate suspension order that immediately and without court process terminates the distributor's ability to distribute prescription drugs. Prior to last Congress, the Controlled Substances Act did not define what constitutes an imminent danger to the public health or safety. This left DEA's ability to immediately suspend a party's ability to distribute prescription drugs essentially unfettered. Such unfettered discretion concerned the patient advocacy and drug manufacturing community because an immediate suspension order cuts off all drugs from a distributor, including those intended for legitimate

users. A balance is needed to ensure that individuals who need prescription drugs for treatment receive them but that such drugs are not diverted for improper purposes.

So the bill I helped negotiate last Congress, for the first time, defined what constitutes an imminent danger to the public health or safety. In doing so, it created a standard for when DEA may suspend a party's registration to distribute prescription drugs without any prior court process, and that standard is that there must be a "substantial likelihood of an immediate threat" that death, serious bodily harm, or abuse of a controlled substance will occur in the absence of an immediate suspension.

In both committee and floor statements, I made clear that this standard is intended to cover situations where evidence of diversion indicates there is a substantial likelihood that abuse of a controlled substance or of any controlled substances will occur.

The Washington Post article glosses over much of this background. It does not explain that the immediate suspension order is intended to be an extraordinary measure. It does not explain that prior to the bill, DEA had basically carte blanche authority to impose this measure. It does not explain the DEA has other enforcement tools available, including show cause orders which are supposed to be the agency's standard operating procedure. Equally problematic, the article barely even mentions the patient advocacy concerns that motivated the bill to begin with.

I want to quote from a letter that a coalition of patient and health advocacy groups sent to Congress in support of the legislation:

Federal agencies, law enforcement, pharmaceutical industry participants and prescribers each play a role in working diligently to prevent drug abuse and diversion. However, it is also imperative that legitimate patients are able to obtain their prescriptions without disruption. Your legislation addresses both goals by fostering greater collaboration, communication and transparency between industry stakeholders and regulators, leading to more effective efforts to combat abuse while protecting patients.

The letter was signed by, among others, the American Academy of Pain Management, the Fibromyalgia & Chronic Pain Support Network, and the Drug Free America Foundation.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 4, 2015.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS HATCH AND WHITEHOUSE: On behalf of the patient and health professional groups listed below we would like to express our support for the Ensuring Patient

Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2015 (S. 483). We appreciate your leadership and commitment to combating the inappropriate use of prescription medicines. Your legislation will help improve the balance between effective enforcement against prescription drug diversion and abuse, while ensuring patients who are appropriately prescribed medications continue to have access to their treatments.

As patient advocacy and health professional organizations, we are committed to combating illegal use of prescription drugs. Millions of Americans depend on prescription drugs to treat and cure illness, alleviate pain, and improve quality of life, yet prescription drug abuse remains a persistent problem that requires collaboration from all those with a stake in improving patient care and protecting against abuse. In considering the burden on patients, it is important to remember that the vast majority of patients who use prescription drugs do so legitimately to address a variety of health issues. Efforts to prevent drug abuse should also consider legitimate users so that actions do not impede patient access or lessen the effectiveness of patient care.

Federal agencies, law enforcement, pharmaceutical industry participants and prescribers each play a role in working diligently to prevent drug abuse and diversion. However, it is also imperative that legitimate patients are able to obtain their prescriptions without disruption. Your legislation addresses both goals by fostering greater collaboration, communication and transparency between industry stakeholders and regulators, leading to more effective efforts to combat abuse while protecting patients. We commend you for including a report to congress, which will illuminate the issue and ultimately benefit patient care. Including patient advocacy groups in the process will ensure those involved in patient care will be able to identify challenges and will emphasize appropriate and workable policy approaches to preventing diversion and abuse of controlled substances.

We commend you for your leadership on this important issue.

Sincerely,

Alliance for Patient Access; American Academy of Pain Management; American Pharmacists Association; American Society of Consultant Pharmacists; American Society for Pain Management Nursing; Center for Lawful Access and Abuse Deterrence; Drug Free America Foundation, Inc.; Fibro Warriors Living Life; Fibro Friends of Tennessee; Fibromyalgia & Chronic Pain Support Network; Fibromyalgia-ME/CFS Support Center, Inc; Florida Fibromyalgia & Chronic Pain Network.

Hematology/Oncology Pharmacy Association; Interstitial Cystitis Association; Kentuckiana Fibromyalgia Support Group; Lake Oswego Health Center; National Association of Chain Drug Stores; National Community Pharmacists Association; National Fibromyalgia & Chronic Pain Association; The Pain Community; Pain Connection-Chronic Pain Outreach Center, Inc.; Project Lazarus; Richmond Fibromyalgia & Chronic Pain Association; Save Our Society From Drugs; U.S. Pain Foundation; Virginia Fibromyalgia & Chronic Pain Support Group.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, the Washington Post article discusses virtually none of this. Rather, it baldly asserts that Congress cut out DEA's legs from underneath it through a sinister conspiracy of deep-pocketed drug companies and their cunning allies in Congress. Nothing could be further from the truth.

To begin with, I have spent 40 years of my life in the Senate fighting the scourge of drug abuse. I stood side by side with Ronald Reagan in the War on Drugs. In 2000, I coauthored the Drug Addiction Treatment Act, or DATA 2000, one of the first efforts in Congress to address the opioid epidemic. Last year, I led conference negotiations on the Comprehensive Addiction Recovery Act, a landmark piece of legislation that is making a real difference in the fight against opioid and heroin abuse. Currently, I am working on legislation to address opioid addiction in the veteran community. I am no patsy when it comes to drug abuse—prescription or otherwise—and neither are my colleagues.

Indeed, forget me for a moment. Let's take Senator WHITEHOUSE, who helped me negotiate the bill with DEA and DOJ. Are we to believe that Senator WHITEHOUSE, a former Rhode Island attorney general and a former U.S. attorney, a crusader against corporate interests, is somehow in the pocket of the drug companies? Of course not. The charge is laughable on its face.

How about the fact that this bill passed both Houses of Congress by unanimous consent? Did the entire U.S. Congress decide to shield its eyes to the true sinister intent of this legislation? Did the Senate Judiciary Committee, which approved the bill by voice vote, decide to look the other way? This is a committee that includes former prosecutors, state attorneys general, and U.S. attorneys who, at the time, included both the current Attorney General of the United States and the current Senate minority leader.

Are we seriously to believe that Jeff Sessions, the toughest foe of illegal drugs I have ever known in my entire life, sat on his hands while Congress eviscerated the DEA's enforcement authority? No, of course not.

To merely state these allegations is to make clear how utterly ridiculous they really are. Not one Senator or Member of the House opposed this bill. Do you know why? Because DEA, the very agency the bill impacts, the very agency that supposedly can no longer do its job because of this legislation, agreed to let it go forward.

Let me be clear. The DEA could have stopped this bill. They could have stopped it at any time. In fact, they did stop a previous version in 2014 that had different language. I spent months negotiating with DEA and with DOJ until they were at a point they were comfortable allowing the bill to proceed. If they had asked me to hold the bill or to continue negotiations, I would have done so.

I brought the bill to markup only after DEA and DOJ agreed with me on a path forward. Anyone who claims that I or anyone else steamrolled DEA and DOJ on this bill is either ignorant or woefully misinformed.

That brings me to another point that was largely lost in all the insinuations

in the Washington Post article. The language that purportedly eviscerated DEA's enforcement power—that is, the requirement that the DEA show a substantial likelihood of immediate threat before issuing an immediate suspension order—was written by DEA and DOJ lawyers and provided to Hill staff as a proposed compromise.

So let's get this straight. Congress took language that DEA and DOJ wrote, inserted it into the bill, and now Congress is the bad guy? I should note that other aspects of DEA and DOJ's proposed language changed, but that key phrase “substantial likelihood of an immediate threat”—the phrase that critics now point to as gutting DEA's enforcement authority—came from DEA and DOJ. And lest we forget, President Obama signed the bill into law on the advice of his own DEA Administrator.

I think we need to be candid about what is going on here. Opponents of the current administration are trying to derail the President's nominee to be head of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, Representative TOM MARINO, by mischaracterizing and trying to rewrite the history of a bill that he championed. They are being aided in their efforts by a group of former DEA employees who took an extremely hard line against drug companies when they were at the Agency and who are upset that the DEA chose to pursue a more collaborative approach after they left. I don't fault these individuals for their passion, but I do reject the notion that there was some sort of sinister conspiracy at play. And I find it unconscionable that critics of the bill and of Representative MARINO would flat-out ignore the very real patient concerns that motivated this bill and motivated my personal involvement with it. You think this bill was a sop to the drug industry? Tell that to the Fibromyalgia and Chronic Pain Network. Tell that to the American Academy of Pain Management. Tell that to the Drug Free America Foundation.

If we are going to make this bill a political football and try to use it to sink Representative MARINO's nomination, let's tell the full story. Let's be fair. Let's at least be honest. Let's not gin up a one-sided narrative based entirely on the statements of former Agency officials who disagreed with the change of leadership.

No matter how you try to spin it, this is not the latest episode of “House of Cards.” Rather, let's be clear that Members of this body negotiated this bill in good faith with the DEA and the Department of Justice. Let's be clear—the DEA and DOJ themselves generated the language that critics now claim is so problematic. Let's remember that this bill passed by unanimous consent and that every single Member of this body and the House of Representatives agreed to it. Let's remember, too, that the DEA and DOJ could have stopped this bill at any time if they had wanted to but instead chose

to allow it to proceed. After all, they stopped an earlier version in 2014 that had different language. They could have stopped it again. And even after the bill passed Congress, they could have advised President Obama not to sign on. Don't forget that the bill bears his signature. Let's not pretend that DEA, both Houses of Congress, and the Obama White House all somehow wilted under Representative MARINO's nefarious influences.

Provocative headlines and clever framing may drive page hits, but this body's decisions should be based on the full story. It should be based on all the facts. A single news article that tells only one side of the story should not derail a nominee who has a long history of fighting illegal drug use and of helping individuals with chronic conditions obtain treatment. Let's not ignore the full story here in the rush toward easy politics.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

PUERTO RICO RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I want to talk about a matter of life and death. It is happening, as we speak, in Puerto Rico. I went there yesterday. I didn't want to have a flyover of the island, but at the invitation of Governor Rosselló, I got into a helicopter so that I could get up into the mountains and into the areas that have been closed because people hadn't been able to get there on the roads. That is what I wanted to see.

We have had colleagues come back and, because of a flyover in a helicopter, say that they say don't see a lot of damage. Of course not, because they are flying over parts of towns in which most of the structures are concrete blocks. But if you get down there on the ground and go into the structure, then you will see a different story.

First of all, you will smell a different story because the water has accumulated, and now it is turning to mold and mildew—inhabitable conditions. But when you get up into the mountains, you see the places that were cut off. Not until a week ago did they have the roads cleared so that people could get up there. And as we speak, as of yesterday, they are still reconstructing the roads so that people can get on these narrow, winding, little dirt roads that go up through the mountains. So for 2 and a half weeks, communities have been completely cut off, like the one that I saw yesterday, Utuado, which is way up in the mountains.

I want to show you some pictures, but I want you to realize that today is Monday. Next Wednesday will be 4 weeks since the hurricane hit. Can you imagine going into a State with 3.5 million people and 85 percent of the people do not have electricity? And by the way, these are our fellow American citizens; they are just in a territory. Can you imagine going into a State where a month after the hurricane, 50

percent of the people do not have potable water? It is an absolute outrage. And I don't think the American people realize what is happening.

Let me be your eyes by what I saw yesterday. This is a river bottom in the little town of Utuado. This side of the river is cut off from this side of the river because the one bridge washed out. If you look at this structure, the question is, How long is this going to last? It is tilting to the left. Any major rush of water is going to take out this section.

I want you to see how creative these people are. It is hard to see at this distance, but they erected a cable system going over to the other side. They took the basket of a grocery cart, took the wheels and handles off, and this is on a pulley, and these guys are pulling it over here and then they pull it back. This is how people on this side of the river are getting food and water and medicine if they can't walk across. This is how people are surviving. If this section of the bridge goes—and it is just a matter of time—they are going to try to hook up a cable over here at the top of this riverbank over to the top of this riverbank and do the same kind of pulley.

Here in the States, on the mainland, if something like this happened, the Corps of Engineers would be there. We would be rebuilding. The Department of Transportation would be rebuilding that bridge. These are our fellow American citizens, and they are going without.

Let me show you another picture. This is the bank of another river. Let me show you the result. This is what happened. You see this whole house right behind here. I will show you the church in a minute. I asked the pastor: Did the people survive? He said that one was trapped in the house. They were able to get that person out. The others had already fled. But you can see that with the force of the extra rain and the water coming down, houses like that are history.

Here is that same section of the river with the church in the background. The church survived. I talked to the pastor of the church. Here I am having a conversation with the people who live on this side. I asked the pastor whether he lost any parishioners. He did not. On the side of his church, he has a dish, and because he has a generator, he is the only person in this town who has any kind of communication—in this case, through the satellite dish for television. Everything else is being run on generators because there is no electricity. As you know, these generators are not powerful enough to run air-conditioners; therefore, the water accumulates. Mold and mildew start to accumulate, with all the health effects as a result of that.

Does this look like something we would have in this country, or does this look like a third world country? Do the images in these photographs bring to mind other Caribbean nations that we

have seen that have been devastated by earthquakes and hurricanes? Think about what happened to Haiti.

When people go to San Juan—by the way, 85 percent of San Juan is without power. You see these little pockets, and of course they are trying to get the generators going in the hospitals for obvious reasons. They need the generators to go to stations where people are getting their dialysis treatments. That is obvious. But what about the wear and tear on the generators and the replacements?

The Governor of Puerto Rico, Governor Rosselló, has a very ambitious schedule: He wants to restore 95 percent of power by the middle of December. I hope the Governor is right. It has been turned over to the Army Corps of Engineers to get the electrical grid and structures up and running. I am afraid it is going to be a lot longer. I asked for estimates on the immediate needs, especially rebuilding the grid. He said \$4 billion. Are we going to be able to get that for them?

What are going to be the ultimate needs of Puerto Rico? We just heard the Senator from Texas talk about his State and the estimates that you heard out of Texas being as much as \$100 billion. What about the needs of Puerto Rico? What about the needs of Florida? What about the needs of the Virgin Islands?

We have a supplemental coming up, but is that going to take care of the needs of all of those four areas that have been hit hard? If Texas is \$100 billion, a long-term fix for Puerto Rico may well be \$80 billion to \$90 billion. And who knows what it is going to be for Florida and the Virgin Islands. Therefore, are we in this Congress, with or without the leadership of the White House, going to have the stomach to help our fellow American citizens? I am sure we are going to help Texas, and I certainly hope we will help my State of Florida, but are we willing to help the American citizens in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico? It is not a rosy picture, but we hear some Members of Congress come back and say they didn't see a lot of damage. It is people using a pulley they have jerry-rigged across a river to survive with daily supplies of food and fuel and water. You can't see that from the air. If you have no power, you have no water, and you have no sewer systems, then, what you have is chaos.

It has been a month since Hurricane Maria hit Puerto Rico. The hospitals are rationing services while they struggle to get the medicines and the fuel they need to power the generators. The dialysis centers are struggling to get the water and fuel they need to operate.

Like many, I have written, in this case, to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, to urge the Department to do more to help these dialysis centers obtain the supplies they need.

I wanted to come to the floor of the Senate, having gotten back very late

last night from Puerto Rico, and tell the Senate that more needs to be done, and it is going to have to be done for a very long period of time. We have to do more to ensure that the supplies that are reaching the island are getting to those who need them.

Remember, things got piled up in the ports in the first week, and they didn't get out to be distributed. Senator RUBIO and I were saying at the time that it is going to take the U.S. military, which is uniquely organized and capable of distribution of long logistical lines. It wasn't until a week after the hurricane that three-star General Buchanan was put in charge. I met with him and the head of FEMA down in the Puerto Rico area. Finally, those supplies are getting out. These are supplies for survival.

We need to pass a disaster relief package that fully funds Puerto Rico's recovery. We need to provide Puerto Rico with the community development block grant money that Governor Rosselló has requested, just like we need the CDBGs for Texas and Florida and the Virgin Islands as well. We need to make Puerto Rico eligible for permanent work assistance so they can start to rebuild their infrastructure immediately.

I want to make something fairly clear. There should be absolutely no ambiguity about what is going on in Puerto Rico. It isn't rosy. It isn't that you can sit in a comfortable seat in a helicopter looking down from 1,500 or 2,000 feet on structures that look like they are intact, when, in fact, the reality on the ground below is completely different. Certainly, they didn't go up there and see all those bridges washed out in the mountains. They didn't see people scrambling for food. They didn't see the Puerto Rican National Guard rebuilding that little narrow dirt road winding along the banks of that river. They didn't see or walk into the buildings where you would almost be overwhelmed with the smells—the smells, particularly, of mold and mildew.

People have died as a result of this hurricane. People have died because of the lack of supplies and power. Our fellow Americans are dying, and they desperately need our help.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, I have seen it with my own eyes on the ground, and I am here to urge this Congress and the administration that we have to act and act for a very long period of time.

Our citizens in Puerto Rico need our help. We have the responsibility to help fellow citizens in need.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Gingrich nomination?

The yeas and nays have been previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 217 Ex.]

YEAS—70

Alexander	Ernst	Murray
Baldwin	Feinstein	Paul
Barrasso	Fischer	Perdue
Bennet	Flake	Reed
Blunt	Franken	Risch
Boozman	Gardner	Roberts
Burr	Grassley	Rounds
Cantwell	Hatch	Rubio
Capito	Heitkamp	Sasse
Cardin	Heller	Schumer
Carper	Hoeven	Scott
Casey	Inhofe	Shaheen
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Collins	Kaine	Strange
Coons	Kennedy	Sullivan
Corker	King	Thune
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Toomey
Cotton	Lee	Warner
Crapo	Manchin	Whitehouse
Cruz	McCaskill	Wicker
Daines	McConnell	Young
Donnelly	Murkowski	
Enzi	Murphy	

NAYS—23

Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Stabenow
Brown	Leahy	Tester
Duckworth	Markey	Udall
Durbin	Merkley	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Nelson	Warren
Harris	Peters	Wyden
Hassan	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—7

Cochran	McCain	Portman
Graham	Menendez	
Isakson	Moran	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to the Gingrich nomination, the motion to consider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Trachtenberg nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of David Joel Trachtenberg, of Virginia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, Senator WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF TOM MARINO

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the addiction epidemic is a national emergency that takes far too many lives and destroys too many families across the country. Unfortunately, my State, in some ways, leads the way. Four thousand Ohioans died from drug overdoses last year, more than any State in the United States. Four thousand families lost a mother, a father, a daughter, a son, a sister, or brother.

We need to treat this epidemic like the public health emergency it is. We asked the President to proclaim it a public health emergency. He talked about it but still hasn't done it.

That is the same reason I can't support Representative TOM MARINO's nomination to head our country's drug control policy. First of all, fundamentally, I don't want an elected official, a politician, in that position. I want somebody from the treatment community. Congressman MARINO is a nominee who, in his time in Congress, showed he was too cozy with the drug companies that helped create this epidemic.

Earlier today, President Trump responded to reports about Congressman MARINO and said he is looking at those reports very closely. I hope he does. I hope he withdraws that nomination. Make no mistake, Congressman MARINO does not want to take us in the right direction in this fight.

Today I was in Austintown—a township on the edge of Youngstown, in Mahoning County—talking to Officer Toth and Chief Gavalier at the Austintown Police Department about the opioid crisis. It is coming up on Drug Take Back Day, where on Saturday all over the country, the DEA is asking police departments to allow people to bring their unused drugs in to get them out of the medicine cabinets. We were talking about much more than that. We were talking about how State governments and the Federal Government haven't stepped up the way we should to partner on prevention and education in medication-assisted therapy treatment and all the things we should be doing.

Mr. MARINO seems to think we arrest our way out of this problem, but that is not what law enforcement officials across this country are saying. Detective Toth and I didn't talk about arresting people's children and arresting

parents. We talked about how to promote the Department's Drug Take Back Day.

Addiction isn't an individual problem or a character flaw; it is a chronic disease. We need someone running our drug policy who understands that, not someone who simply wants to pull patients out of treatment in the middle of an epidemic. We know what that was about when on this floor, not much more than a month ago, only by one vote were we able to preserve the treatment that so many opioid-addicted people are getting. Right now, in my State, 200,000 Ohioans are getting opioid treatment because they have insurance under the Affordable Care Act.

We need the enforcement piece. That is why I have introduced the bipartisan INTERDICT Act and why I have worked with Senator PORTMAN on this to make sure we have resources for Customs and Border Protection agents to screen packages effectively and safely before they reach our neighborhood.

It has been more than 8 weeks since President Trump promised a national disaster declaration. We have yet to see a strategy from the White House. Other than a nominee who thinks one locks people up to defeat the opioid epidemic, we have seen no strategy from the White House to deal with the epidemic. Ohio families cannot afford to wait.

Let me close with this. A few months ago, I was in Cincinnati, at the Talbert House, and I met with a father who was there with his 30-year-old daughter. He told me that his daughter would not be there right now, that she would not still be alive, if it were not for Medicaid and the treatment for addiction that she received because of it.

We know what we have to do to deal with this epidemic. I ask the President to do the right thing, and I ask the Senate to do the right thing and move forward. It is the biggest public health emergency in our lifetimes. We need the people who are in charge of our drug control policy to treat it that way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, let me echo the remarks of the senior Senator from Ohio.

Like Ohio, Rhode Island has a very significant opioid problem, and we came together in this Chamber to support the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. I had the privilege of being the principal Democratic author of that piece of legislation, and Senator PORTMAN of Ohio was the principal Republican author of that legislation. We worked for years to set it up—to hold the hearings necessary, to get the information together, to make it work. When we did, it passed this body with a massive bipartisan expression of support.

It makes no sense to nominate somebody to this position who does not understand what we understand, which is